

Sample Questions Detention Enforcement Officer Entry Level Examination



The examination for the Detention Enforcement Officer occupation measures the thinking skills that are critical for making decisions and solving problems on the job. The sample questions presented in this booklet are similar to the questions you will find in the actual examination. In general, the questions deal with topics that are related to Government business. *Remember, however, that no job knowledge is required to answer the questions correctly.*

LOGICAL REASONING

In each of these questions you will be given a paragraph which contains all the information necessary to identify the correct answer. Use **only** the information provided in the paragraph. Do not speculate or make assumptions that go beyond this information. Also, assume that all information given in the paragraph is true, even if it conflicts with some fact that is known to you.

In some questions you will be asked to select the only response option that can be validly concluded from the paragraph. These questions provide a paragraph followed by the statement "*From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that*" and five response options. In other questions you may be asked to select the only response option that cannot be validly concluded from the paragraph. These questions provide a paragraph followed by the statement "*From the information given above, it **CANNOT** be validly concluded that*" and five response options.

Pay attention to negated verbs (for example, "are not") and negative prefixes (for example, "incomplete" or "disorganized"). Also pay special attention to words such as "all," "none," and "some." Keep in mind that, in some tests, words such as "all" and "none" often give away incorrect response options. That is **not** the case in this test. Some correct answers have the words "all" or "none" in them.

1. Law enforcement agencies use scientific techniques to identify suspects and to establish guilt. One obvious application of such techniques is the examination of a crime scene. Some substances found at a crime scene yield valuable clues under microscopic examination. Clothing fibers, dirt particles, and even pollen grains may reveal important information to the careful investigator. Nothing can be overlooked because all substances found at a crime scene are potential sources of evidence.

From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that

- A) all substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination are substances found at a crime scene
- B) no potential sources of evidence are substances found at a crime scene
- C) some substances found at a crime scene are not potential sources of evidence
- D) some potential sources of evidence are substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination
- E) some substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination are not substances found at a crime scene

The correct answer is response D. The essential information in the paragraph is contained in the third and fifth sentences. The third sentence tells us that “some substances found at a crime scene yield valuable clues under microscopic examination.” The fifth sentence explains that “...all substances found at a crime scene are potential sources of evidence.” Therefore, we can conclude that “some potential sources of evidence are substances that yield valuable clues under microscopic examination.” Response A **cannot** be inferred because the paragraph does not support the statement that all substances which yield valuable clues are found exclusively at a crime scene. It may be that valuable clues could be found elsewhere. Responses B and C are incorrect because they contradict the fifth sentence of the paragraph, which clearly states that “all substances found at a crime scene are potential sources of evidence.” Response E is incorrect because the paragraph provides no information about the value of substances found somewhere other than at the crime scene.

2. Phyllis T. is a former Federal employee who was entitled to benefits under the Federal Employee Compensation Act because of a job-related, disabling injury. When an eligible Federal employee has such an injury, the benefit is determined by this test: If the beneficiary is married or has dependents, benefits are $\frac{3}{4}$ of the person's salary at the time of the injury; otherwise, benefits are set at $\frac{2}{3}$ of the salary. Phyllis T.'s benefits were $\frac{2}{3}$ of her salary when she was injured.

From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that, when Phyllis T. was injured, she

- A) was married but without dependents
- B) was not married and had no dependents
- C) was not married but had dependents
- D) was married and had dependents
- E) had never been married

The correct answer is response B. This question concerns an either/or situation. The paragraph states that benefits under the Federal Employee Compensation Act are awarded at one level ($\frac{3}{4}$ of salary) if a beneficiary is married or has dependents when injured and at another level ($\frac{2}{3}$ of salary) if this is not true. Phyllis T. is eligible for benefits under the Act. The paragraph states that Phyllis T.'s benefit level was $\frac{2}{3}$ of her salary. Given this benefit level, it is clear that Phyllis T. did not meet either of the conditions for the

3/4 level. Therefore, responses A, C, and D cannot be correct (A states that she was married, C states that she had dependents, and D states that she both was married and had dependents). Response E goes beyond the facts given because prior marriages are not listed as a factor relating to this benefit. The one correct conclusion is that Phyllis T. did not meet either requirement to qualify for the higher benefit level (3/4 of salary), so response B is the correct answer to the question.

3. A rapidly changing technical environment in government is promoting greater reliance on electronic mail (e-mail) systems. As the use of e-mail grows, there are increasing chances of conflict between the users' expectations of privacy and public access rights. In some investigations, access to all e-mail, including those messages stored in archival files and messages outside the scope of the investigation, has been sought and granted. In spite of this, some people send messages through e-mail that would never be said face-to-face or written formally.

*From the information given above, it **CANNOT** be validly concluded that*

- A) some e-mail messages that have been requested as part of investigations have contained messages that would never be said face-to-face
- B) some messages that people would never say face-to-face are sent in e-mail messages
- C) some e-mail messages have been requested as part of investigations
- D) e-mail messages have not been exempted from investigations
- E) some e-mail messages contain information that would be omitted from formal writing

This question asks for the conclusion that is **NOT** valid. That means that four of the statements are valid conclusions while one is not. Response B is a valid conclusion because it restates a fact given in the last sentence of the paragraph. Response E is valid because it restates the other fact in the last sentence of the paragraph. The next-to-last sentence in the paragraph is the source of both response C and response D. Both of these choices restate information in that sentence, based on the fact that access to e-mail messages was sought and granted. This leaves only the first option, response A. This is the only choice that does **NOT** represent a valid conclusion. Even though we know from the paragraph that there is a group of e-mail messages that are requested in investigations and also that there is a group of messages that contain information that people would not say face-to-face, there is nothing that says that these groups overlap. We simply do not know from the information presented in the paragraph.

4. Police officers were led to believe that many weapons sold at a certain gun store were sold illegally. Upon investigating the lead, the officers learned that all of the weapons sold by the store that were made by Precision Arms were sold legally. Also, none of the illegally sold weapons were .45 caliber.

From the information given above, it can be validly concluded that, concerning the weapons sold at the store,

- A) all of the .45 caliber weapons were made by Precision Arms
- B) none of the .45 caliber weapons were made by Precision Arms
- C) some of the weapons made by Precision Arms were .45 caliber weapons
- D) all of the .45 caliber weapons were sold legally
- E) some of the weapons made by Precision Arms were sold illegally

The correct answer is response D. The second and last sentences are the two main premises in the paragraph. These two sentences give information about three categories of weapons: weapons made by Precision Arms, weapons sold legally, and .45 caliber weapons. The last sentence states that none of the illegally sold weapons were .45 caliber. This means that none of the .45 caliber weapons were sold illegally. Notice that this new statement is a double negative. In affirmative form the statement means that all of the .45 caliber weapons were sold legally, Choice D. The information that all of the .45 caliber weapons were sold legally (last sentence), combined with the information that all of the weapons made by Precision Arms were sold legally (second sentence), allows us to draw no valid conclusions about the relationship between the .45 caliber weapons and the weapons made by Precision Arms. There is insufficient information about the entire group of weapons sold legally to know whether the group of .45 caliber weapons and the group of weapons made by Precision Arms overlapped entirely (Choice A), partially (Choice C), or not at all (Choice B). Choice E contradicts the second sentence and is, therefore, invalid.